

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 10 and 12 are herein amended. No new matter has been added.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Racich et al., U.S. Patent Number 4,591,512, of record (hereafter Racich) in view of Nakane et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,374,972, of record (hereafter Nakane). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1, as herein amended, recites “the films are vertically aligned and simultaneously dipped into at least one type of processing liquid without contacting each other” and claim 10, as herein amended, recites “a film delivery holder ... configured to deliver a plurality of films which are played out from the rolled raw films in a state where the films are vertically aligned so as to simultaneously dip the films into the processing liquid without contacting each other.”

Neither Racich nor Nakane discloses, teaches, suggests or provides any reason for having the films dipped into the processing liquid be vertically aligned. When producing a polarizing film, the size of the film in the width direction thereof is likely to be changed since the films are expanded or contracted in the dipping step or stretching step. If the films are produced in a state where the films are horizontally aligned, the films may be in contact with each other due to width variation of the films. Due to the width variation of the films, one of ordinary skill in the art

would need to secure a sufficient width of the producing apparatus, in order to avoid contact of the films with one another. Accordingly, such an apparatus would be large in size.

On the other hand, when the films are aligned vertically, as recited in the presently claimed invention, the contact between the films may be avoided.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Racich et al., U.S. Patent Number 4,591,512, of record (hereafter Racich) in view of Nakane et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,374,972, of record (hereafter Nakane) as applied to claims 1, 2, 4 and 10-12 above, and further in view of Kondo et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0182427 A1, of record (hereafter Kondo). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Racich in view of Nakane does not render the presently claimed invention obvious. The deficiencies of Racich in view of Nakane are not overcome by the disclosure of Kondo.

Kondo does not disclose, teach, suggest or provide any reason for having the films dipped into the processing liquid be vertically aligned.

Thus, the combined reading of Racich in view of Nakane further in view of Kondo fails to render the presently claimed invention obvious.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Application No.: 10/573,646  
Art Unit: 2872

Submission under 37 C.F.R. §1.114  
Attorney Docket No.: 062338

For at least the foregoing reasons, the claimed invention distinguishes over the cited art and defines patentable subject matter. Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by applicants would be desirable to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' undersigned attorney.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**

/BERNADETTE K. MCGANN/

Bernadette K. McGann  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 65,127  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

SGA/BKM/bam